4139.9.1

STRICTURES

ON THE

PROPHECIES

OF

RICHARD BROTHERS,

&c.

STRICTURES

ON THE

PROPHECIES

OF

RICHARD BROTHERS,

&c.

BRITISH MUSEUM

STRICTURES

ON THE

PROPHECIES

OF

RICHARD BROTHERS;

AND THE

PUBLICATIONS AND PARLIAMENTARY CONDUCT

OF

NATHANIEL BRASSEY HALHED, Esq.

IN THEIR DEFENCE.

BY A COUNTRY CURATE.

" Beware of falſe Prophets," Matt. vii. 15.

" There ſhall ariſe falſe Prophets." Ibid. xxiv. 24.

" Beware leſt any Man ſpoil you through Philoſophy and vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Chriſt." Coloſſ. ii. 8.

OXFORD:

Printed for the Author: and ſold by R. Bliſs, Bookſeller, High Street; Meſſrs. Rivingtons, St. Paul's Church-Yard; Meſſrs. Vernon and Hood, Birchin-Lane, Cornhill, London; Cafe, High Wycombe; Cowſlade, Reading; Norton, Henley; and by the Bookſellers at Ayleſbury.

1795.

BRITISH MUSEUM

To the READER.

THESE Strictures were written at the requeſt of a female friend, who deſired the Author's opinion on the Works in queſtion. The taſk he undertook with pleaſure, by reaſon of a high reſpect for the perſon ſoliciting: He was alſo urged to it by a conviction of the duty incumbent on the Miniſters of Chriſt's Goſpel to give an anſwer, according to the abilities wherewith God has endued them, reſpecting their faith, and whatever, either directly or indirectly, concerns it. The Author has ſince been adviſed to publiſh the Letter, as calculated to undeceive the weak and unlearned, who alone can have been made victims to ſuch miſerable, inconſiſtent, contradictory, and impious aſſertions. He therefore ſubmits it to the candour of a diſcerning Public. He doth not defy the cenſure of Critics, yet ſhall hold the reſcue of one individual from ſo dangerous a deluſion, ſuperior to all other

other conſiderations. As theſe Strictures were written in a familiar Epiſtle to an intimate friend, and now publiſhed for the information of the unlearned, and thoſe whoſe avocations have neceſſarily directed their attention to other objects, the Author ſtrenuouſly recommends them (if opportunity ſhould occur) to peruſe with care Newton's Diſſertations on the Prophecies, and Fleming's Apocalyptical Key, from which books he hath extracted and epitomized the explanations of the four Beaſts, Dan. vii. and the account of the Millennium. Obſerve farther, that the Author hath endeavoured to diveſt the ſubſequent Letter of all political diſcuſſion, and to dictate it in the ſpirit of Chriſtian charity,—as far as the tendency of the doctrines propagated would prudently admit.

To

To Mr. HALHED.

SIR,

I HAVE noticed what appeared to me the prominent features of your books and conduct, and the publications of Richard Brothers. To embrace an elucidation of all the Scripture quotations of the latter, would require ſeveral folio volumes; and it is very artful in Mr. B. thus to pack together ſuch an immenſe quantity of Scripture, incoherently, inapplicably, and unexplained; being conſcious that his writings need but to be ſeen in any fair point of view, to be detected of fallacy by the meaneſt capacity. Some prudential reaſons render it neceſſary for the Author to conceal his name, and not, Sir, from any deſire to avoid any further controverſy with you on this ſubject. I will even believe that you are now become as credulous as you profeſs yourſelf. Many a perſon hath imagined a falſe ſtory to be true, from long habit of telling it as ſuch.

Whatever

Whatever your preſent feelings may be, they will, if traced to their original ſource, be found, I doubt not, to have originated in vexatious diſappointment. That you may employ your abilities more worthily for the future, is the ſincere hope of the well-wiſher of yourſelf, Richard Brothers, and every other individual, however their opinions may differ from thoſe of the Author of theſe Strictures.

STRIC-

STRICTURES, &c.

GREAT indeed muſt be the apathy of that perſon, whom the Prophecies of B.* do not agitate with a religious awe, horror, or commiſeration: of religious awe, if his denunciations are juſtly ſupported; of horror at his blaſphemy, if his pretenſions are unfounded; and of commiſeration, if they are the effuſions of a deranged intellect. But when H.—a man of ſuperior rank, education and abilities—ſteps forward in defence of this ſelf-nominated Prophet, it muſt excite the greateſt aſtoniſhment; and ſurely, unleſs he can produce the moſt ſolid arguments, much indignation. And how naturally muſt every Engliſhman wiſh, that both the one and the other ſhould meet condign puniſhment, if it is a mere political trick: how unpardonable, that any individual, or cabal, ſhould daringly violate the laws of this realm, or impiouſly diſturb the peace of mind of the unlearned, to ſerve any private, intereſted motives.

Now the works of B. and H. certainly appear in a very queſtionable ſhape, and they ought—unleſs they can be ſanctioned by the wiſe diſpenſations

* As it will be neceſſary often to mention the names of Richard Brothers and Mr. Halhed, I ſhall allude to them by the initials of B. and H.; not from diſreſpect, but for the ſake of brevity.

of Providence, and the inſpired writings—to be held in ridicule and contempt; to this criterion, therefore, let us bring them, as by this alone they ought to ſtand or fall: the man who deſires to ſupport them by any other teſt, muſt be accounted an infidel, and deſpiſed in this land, where the Goſpel ſhines ſo bright; to ſuch I ſpeak not, they are unworthy notice.

Let us proceed to inveſtigate candidly B's pretenſions to thoſe exalted characters, under the aſſumption of which he challenges the attention of this kingdom in particular, and Europe in general, to his books.

B. calls himſelf the Servant of God. It is an eſtabliſhed maxim of morality, as well as a poſitive precept of chriſtianity, for ſervants to receive inſtructions from their maſters; and that to whomſoever we yield obedience, their ſervants we are: whether B. is, or is not, the Servant of God, I ſhall leave you to conclude for yourſelf, from what I am about to ſay.

As a prince of the Jews, appointed by God to that office, to lead them from among all nations, where they ſojourn, to the ſite of Jeruſalem, and there to reign over them as an eminently flouriſhing people; he purſues a method very different from that adopted by Moſes (to whom he particularly compares himſelf), and invariably adhered to by the prophets in the Old, and our Saviour, his apoſtles and diſciples in the New, Teſtament. Inſtead of firſt and publickly addreſſing the Jews, he applies himſelf to the eſtabliſhed government

of

of this country, altogether unmindful of their departure in his proceedings, and apparently conſulting the proſperity of the Britiſh nation alone. Now when God appeared unto Moſes in Midian, and ordered him to go into Egypt to lead his brethren thence; he removed his doubts and heſitations by two miracles, which—together with another if found neceſſary—were to be performed on his manifeſting himſelf to the Jews: he alſo ordered him to make known his commiſſion to the children of Iſrael immediately, and unreſervedly to demand their departure from Pharaoh. Accordingly we find, that he directly applied to the Jews, who—upon ſeeing the ſigns—readily believed; and Moſes and Aaron boldly went in, and told Pharaoh,—" Thus ſaith the Lord God of Iſrael, let my people go." Again; if we conſult the hiſtories of the prophets in the Old, and our Saviour, his apoſtles and diſciples in the New, Teſtament, my obſervation will invariably be found true. For all theſe applied themſelves forthwith to the diſcharge of their reſpective miſſions, publickly and undauntingly: becauſe they knew, that they were delegated by the Moſt High, and therefore feared not what man could do unto them. But B., inſtead of exerting himſelf in his pretended office, indolently leaves the Jews to ſeek him, and—where confidence in God, and diſregard of human authority, ought to be diſplayed—does betray an evident fear, by the uſe of the following expreſſions: " He had not permiſſion to inform the people of London of their danger, and

to try to ſave them; becauſe they would impriſon and uſe him ill for it;"—" I have ſubjected myſelf to the power of human laws, when indeed I had the choice to make them ſubject unto me;"—" beſides, I am not mortal to human power;"—" there is nothing in this book that the Engliſh law can take hold of: ſo ſays him that Iſaiah the prophet calls wonderful counſellor." H.* or any man of the leaſt diſcernment, cannot deny, that the ſentences quoted indicate much apprehenſion, and no ſmall degree of contradiction.

Being always, I truſt, open to conviction, I have endeavoured—if the leaſt ſimilarity could be obtained between Moſes and B.; but in vain. B. tells us, that—by the command of God—he cut a rod in 1792, with which, in due time, he was to perform the ſame miracle as that of Moſes; and H. marks this out as one of the ſtriking ſimilarities: but it ſhould be recollected, that Moſes caſually had this rod with him, and the miracle was primarily wrought to remove his doubts, and afterwards for the conviction of the Jews. We are not, conſequently, bound to abide by B's word, or H's credulity; for our belief is not demanded by Scripture authority. H's compariſon of Moſes and B.—the former having been preſerved in the ark of bulruſhes, and the latter having been bred to the navy—is ſo futile, that he certainly muſt

* Though H. calls him,—" a peaſant exalting himſelf above the mightieſt of princes: affirming, that he is utterly invulnerable to all human power; and braving, with the moſt unruffled indifference, that Government, &c."

have

have made it inconſiderately, and doubtleſs has repented of its publication: beſides, he would have done well to recollect, that the preſervation of Moſes was an extraordinary interpoſition of God; whereas the caſe of B. (in this, as well as all other things) is a mere ordinary occurrence. Again, after H's adoption of B's dogmatic poſition—that London is ſpiritually called Sodom in Egypt, and his abortive attempts to ſubſtantiate it; his concluſive parallel from thence is abſolutely falſe *: B. was not born in London, but in Newfoundland.

Let us next conſider the particular paſſage B. quotes, and which he declares to mean himſelf; and that as Moſes was but a man, to a man like himſelf he alludes: "The Lord thy God will raiſe up unto thee a prophet, from the midſt of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye ſhall hearken." Strange it is truly, that an inſpired perſon ſhould be ignorant of one of the moſt obvious ſentences of Scripture! The compaſs of this treatiſe will not admit a deſignation of all the particulars, wherein Chriſt was like unto Moſes; neither indeed is it neceſſary: I ſhall point out four important reſemblances, as being fully adequate to my purpoſe. God had graciouſly revealed from time to time, and confirmed, his original

* "That Moſes, born in Egypt, led the Iſraelites from thence into the promiſed land, the birth-place of the ſecond Moſes, and the country from whence he is to ſummon the modern Hebrews, muſt, ſpiritually at leaſt, have been denominated Egypt, to make the parallel between the two events move on all fours."

promiſe of a Mediator; and it muſt have been by divine inſpiration that Moſes ſo emphatically ſaid —" A Prophet like unto me;" *i. e.* a Prophet, Lawgiver, Prieſt, and King or Leader: a Prophet, for as Moſes propheſied the coming of the Meſſiah, and conſequently the deſtruction of the Jewiſh diſpenſation; ſo Chriſt foretold the diſperſion of the Iſraelites more particularly, and under the ſame prediction the conſummation of all things: a Lawgiver, that as Moſes received the commandments of the Moſt High, and delivered them unto the Jews; ſo Chriſt, ſent by the Father, was the Divulger of a new Law, by the publication of the bleſſed Goſpel: a Prieſt, that as Moſes offered up the ſacrifices under the Law (the types and figures of Chriſt) for the atonement of the tranſgreſſions of the people, and was therefore an interceſſor between God and man; ſo our Saviour, by the ſacrifice of Himſelf, propitiated the ſins of the world, and became the bleſſed Mediator between mankind and the Almighty—making continual interceſſion for us: a King or Leader, that as Moſes led the people of Iſrael from Egypt, through the red ſea, and the barren wilderneſs, into the good land of Canaan; ſo will Chriſt lead all good men through the difficulties and embarraſſments of mortality to the boſom of their Father and their God,—the true heavenly Canaan. Many other ſimilarities, between Moſes and Chriſt, might be enumerated; but thoſe cited are, ſurely, ſufficient: however, the mention of two other ſtrong reſemblances—the conſecration to, and completion

pletion of, their miniſtries—will not, I conceive, be impertinent. As God appeared unto Moſes in the buſh, when he received his appointment to deliver the children of Iſrael from Egyptian bondage; ſo a voice from Heaven declared in atteſtation of Chriſt, when He publicly undertook the reſcue of miſerable ſinners from the bondage of Sin and Satan: and as Moſes died, when he had brought the Iſraelites in ſight of the promiſed land; ſo Chriſt—when He had completed our Redemption, when he ſaw the heavenly Canaan open to all believers—ſaid, "It is finiſhed," and gave up the ghoſt. As to B's objection, that as Moſes was but a man, to a man like himſelf he alludes, if he had underſtood the firſt rudiments of Chriſtianity, the Incarnation of Chriſt, he would not have made it; and if he had read the Scriptures with obſervation and diſcernment, he would have known that Chriſt, when the œconomy of our Salvation is mentioned, is called—"Man, and the Son of Man."

Moreover, I totally diſſent from B's doctrine reſpecting the Jews becoming again the peculiar people of * God, according to his account thereof; though I am firmly perſuaded of the recal of the Jews into the Church of God. I conſider them to have been ſo highly favoured of Heaven, not merely for their own advantage, but to maintain a knowledge of the one true God in the world; and

* Though H. ſays, that "no man who has but a ſmattering of acquaintance with Scripture or tradition can for a moment pretend to deny."

that the grand object in view, was the happineſs of the whole human race: for the gracious revelation of God to Abraham, his ſubſequent revelation to Moſes, his wonderful preſervation of the Hebrews, and his inſpiration of the Prophets in ſucceeding ages, diſpelled the gloom of the earth, and reſcued man from all the horrors of ſuperſtition. Ought we not, then, to avoid that ſcorn and contempt, with which it is but too common to look on the Jews; and with the devouteſt regard to eſteem the Old Teſtament? Yet we are not to ſtop here, but to inquire—whether thoſe inſpired writings were not intended as introductory to a more excellent diſpenſation: aſſuredly they were. For when the fulneſs of time came, Chriſt appeared, teaching that true ſpiritual worſhip we owe to the Almighty, becoming the Saviour of all people, nations, and languages,—whether Jews or Gentiles; in Chriſtianity there is neither "Greek nor Jew, Circumciſion nor Uncircumciſion, Barbarian, Scythian, Bond nor Free, but Chriſt is All, and in All," if St. Paul is to be credited: and our bleſſed Redeemer expreſsly ſaith, "I lay down my life for the ſheep; and other ſheep I have, which are not of this fold; them alſo I muſt bring, and they ſhall hear my voice, and there ſhall be one fold, and one ſhepherd." And my poſition, that the Moſaick Law was only intended as introductory to the Goſpel Diſpenſation, is to be proved from innumerable texts of the Old Teſtament; three expreſs ones I ſhall adduce:—"In thee ſhall all families of the earth be bleſſed;"—

"in

" in thy ſeed ſhall all nations of the earth be bleſſed;"—and it is ſpecified, that the wonders performed in Egypt was for this very cauſe, " that God's name might be declared throughout all the earth."—Can any man of a ſound mind believe, that B. ſhould be ſent by the Father to abrogate the laws of the Old and New Teſtaments? eſpecially, without a ſingle power whereby he ought to be accredited.

But though " the diminiſhing of the Jews is the riches of the Gentiles, and the caſting away of them is the reconciling of the world;" ſtill the kingdom of Heaven is equally open to them, as to others, upon their converſion to Chriſtianity: and we juſtly look for a happy condition of the church, when the Jews alſo will be convinced—that Chriſt was really the Meſſiah, and be incorporated with the whole body of Chriſtians.—It is indeed very probable, that—upon the Mahometans embracing Chriſtianity, which muſt take place before the Millennium—the country of the antient Hebrews may be a flouriſhing land: yet as the new Heavens and the new Earth in Iſaiah, allude to a change in the Hebrews for the better, which happened after their captivity, and having alſo a reference to the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity, and conſequently rendering void the Levitical Law; ſo the mention of the new Heavens and the new Earth, and the new Jeruſalem (by St. Peter and in the Revelations) have a view to the bleſſed ſtate of the church which is ſo generally looked for before the conſummation of all things, and

alſo

alſo the happineſs of the Saints in Heaven hereafter; and ſome have likewiſe, with much propriety, concluded, that they had a primary reference to the flouriſhing ſtate of Chriſtianity in the time of Conſtantine.

I ſhall next advert to H's obſervation, when ſpeaking of B's publications, — " replete with grammatical faults; deſtitute alike of harmony of arrangement, and elegance of diction"—as an undeniable argument againſt the inſpiration of the writings; and I am happy to be able, in one inſtance, to coincide with that gentleman.

It is obſervable, through the whole of the Old and New Teſtaments, that there is a beautiful harmony and agreement, that every event progreſſively enlightened the world, and tended to diſſipate the difficulties of the antecedent prophecies and diſpenſations; until the Sun of Righteouſneſs aroſe, who hath diſperſed the intellectual darkneſs of the earth; and thus the glimmerings have been ſucceeded by the perfect day. But B's works are truly without " harmony of arrangement."

There is alſo a ſublimity in the inſpired writings, a beautiful metaphor, a forcible yet plain ſtyle—as dictated by a God of perfect wiſdom—which is unparalleled in the productions of all other languages. Where can more profound humility, or more dignity of language be found, than in Moſes's juſtly-admired ſong of thankſgiving, for the miraculous paſſage through the red ſea; " I will ſing unto the Lord, &c." (Exod. xv.)? If we peruſe the other parts of the Old Teſtament,

Teſtament, we ſhall find a conciſeneſs, comprehenſiveneſs, juſtneſs and ſublimity pervade the whole. The New Teſtament will alſo be found to contain the moſt admirable models of compoſition: let us examine the diſcourſes of our bleſſed Redeemer; let us obſerve the devout joy and humility of ſoul in the bleſſed Virgin,—"My ſoul doth magnify, &c." (Luke i. 46, &c.) and let us recollect the incomparable oratory of Paul's defence before King Agrippa. But B's compoſitions are certainly "replete with grammatical faults, and deſtitute of elegance of diction."

In the ſelection of the foregoing examples, I mean only to call your attention to paſſages well known, and too frequently heard and read with indifference; but confeſs, that I do not think there is a verſe in the Old or New Teſtament, which will not demonſtrate the truth of my aſſertion.—What otherwiſe is to be expected in writings ſuggeſted by the Holy Ghoſt?

And farther, as the ſuggeſtions and actions of an omniſcient and wiſe God will be perfect and conſiſtent in all their parts, how little claim can B's abſurdities and inconſiſtencies—of the intended deſtruction of London—give him to the title of an inſpired Prophet! He informs us,—"God could not in juſtice to his recorded judgment ſpare London, at his intreaties; but as He had repeatedly promiſed by his Angel to make him happy, for his ſake He would ſhew mercy to ſome:" Why does B. mention W^m. Pitt, the perſon he had warned of the danger of his proceedings as Miniſter,

ter, and *who had deſpiſed the exhortations of God's Prophet?* And—" God ſaid He would ſhake the Admiralty, as a man would violently bread in a baſket, until it was ſhook to pieces for the injury B. had received;" yet " God aſks him, if he will not mention John Pitt, that he might be forgiven:" the very man who was at the head of that body, who had him dragged to a workhouſe, and deprived him of his due *(according to B.)*, becauſe he would not take an improper oath, at a time when he wanted a bit of bread; and even called him out of his ſenſes, which B. argues, in another place, is the dangerous ſin of blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and which is not to be forgiven. Again; the Lord declared—though ten days before He affirmed, He could not ſpare London at his intreaties—that " He would ſpare London and all the people in it." Can ſuch inconſiſtency and variableneſs be credited of God? Moreover, if B. had not intreated, London and all in it would have been deſtroyed; conſequently the Jews, who were to be gathered together and depart on their way to Jeruſalem, agreeable to B's aſſertion, by the beginning of June next.

B. ſays, that God told him—" You may inform the King of England, that I call you my nephew;" this H. attempts to ſupport, by thoſe ſentences B. adduces to prove it. I am ſorry to find *a prophet and his ſupporter* totally ignorant of Scripture phraſeology, and only capable of forming a judgment from the vulgar ideas of words and language: by this rule our Saviour's addreſs to his mother,

mother, John ii. 4. and xix. 2, muſt be deemed harſh and undutiful, becauſe He calls her "Woman;" but among the antients it was addreſſed to perſons of ſuperior rank, and thoſe for whom reverence was held by the ſpeaker. And in Scripture, and among the antients, the words Brother and Siſter very generally mean nothing more than near relations: ſometimes a people at large is alluded to by the word Brethren; thus, "the Lord thy God will raiſe up unto thee a prophet, from the midſt of thee, of *thy Brethren:*" ſometimes it has been applied to a concourſe of perſons—"Jeſus ſtretched forth his hands towards his diſciples, and ſaid, Behold my mother and *my Brethren:*" And did not the cuſtom obtain among the apoſtles and immediate diſciples of Chriſt, and hath it not been continued by all ſucceeding miniſters, to addreſs themſelves to thoſe, to whom they either wrote or ſpoke, by the appellation of *brethren?* And it is extremely ſhocking to a religious mind to imagine, that the bleſſed Virgin ſhould have been connected with man, being ſo peculiarly conſecrated to God. In Matt. i. 25. "he knew her not *till* ſhe had brought forth her *firſt-born* Son:" the word *till* doth not infer (as Dr. Trapp obſerves), that Joſeph knew her afterwards; thus 2 Sam. vi. 23. "Michal the daughter of Saul had no child *until* the day of her death;" ſee alſo 1 Sam. xv. 35: neither doth her firſt-born infer, that ſhe had another child afterwards,—for an *only child* is frequently called the *firſt*, and to be *firſt-born* and *to open the womb* are terms ſynonimous;

ſee Exod. xiii. 2. If Mary had had more children, it would have been matter of notoriety: and Chriſt's addreſs to his mother and the diſciple whom he loved (John xix. 25, 26, 27.), not only makes it reaſonable to conclude, that Joſeph was then dead, but ſatisfactorily evinces that Mary had no other child than Jeſus.

Another paſſage in B's publications muſt ſtrike with horror the ears of the pious and conſiderate*; it is this: "He was carried up into Heaven, and ſaw a beautiful ſilver white bird in the ſhape of a dove; it was the Holy Ghoſt, and was the very ſame that deſcended on the head of my bleſſed Saviour." Unleſs inſanity, no other excuſe can vindicate ſuch a declaration from the crime of blaſphemy; to preſume to liken the bleſſed Spirit to any created being, however innocent. "The Spirit of God deſcending like a dove, and lighting upon Him" (Matt. iii. 16), is to be underſtood *as a dove† hovers before it alights*; and it would certainly have been better to tranſlate the Greek word ὡσεὶ—*as it were*, or *like as*, to prevent vulgar miſconception: thus the ſame word is rendered Acts ii. v. 3.—"tongues *like as* of fire;" *i. e.* in the colour or form, but not really fiery,

* Though H. ſays,—"that the Holy Ghoſt actually appeared as a dove, when Jeſus was baptized; he preſumes no believer in the Goſpel will think fit to conteſt with him."

† Obſerve that σωματικῷ (Luke iii. 22.) would be ſuperfluous, if it was really like a dove in bodily ſhape, and εἴδει would rightly have been tranſlated *appearance*; agreeable to εἶδε Matt. and Mark, and τεθέαμαι John.

otherwiſe

otherwiſe they would have burnt the Apoſtles. St. John, who alone is ſuppoſed to have ſeen this atteſtation of Chriſt—to ſhew him that this was the Meſſiah of whom he was the harbinger, expreſsly deſcribes it καταβαῖνον * ὡσεὶ *coming down as it were*, in alluſion to its *hovering*; as in common language we ſhould ſay—any thing was *like an arrow*, on account of its paſſing with *great velocity through the air*. Had B. or H. known the ſignification of ὡσεὶ, they would alſo have known that it ſignifies —*as it were, even as*, &c. but in no one inſtance *like unto in form or figure*.

Although a man might not give an implicit belief to B. yet no one, having the leaſt regard for his ſoul, would venture to call him a Madman or Impoſtor, were there the moſt diſtant proſpect of a foundation for his pretenſions; ſtill I heſitate not to affirm ſo, upon the moſt mature deliberation. You may be deſirous to aſcertain which of the two I think him to be; Chriſtian charity ſtrongly induces me to eſteem him the former. By thus determining, I have, according to B. "blaſphemed the Holy Ghoſt, which is not to be forgiven." Now I aſk B. upon what ground—unleſs miſconception of ſeveral paſſages of Scripture, inconſiſtencies, and a new inſtitution of divine diſpenſations—he can expect, or this country be reaſonably required to give, credence to his books. He talks, it is true, of "being elevated to

* Which word is likewiſe uſed by Matthew and Mark, and the word καταβῆναι by Luke.

the

the greateſt principality that ever will be in the world: but what earneſt doth he give us thereof, or of his extraordinary miracles he is to perform? Inſtead of ſo doing, he reſerves a ſalvo—in caſe his predictions, &c. fall to the ground—by telling us the intended courſe of Providence was prevented by his interference. I ſhall venture to inſtruct *this prophet*, why our Saviour ſaid—" that blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſhould not be forgiven, although he that ſpoke againſt the Son of Man might be forgiven:" the ſenſe is obvious. For a perſon might ſpeak againſt Chriſt and his preaching, yet afterwards be convinced, by the miraculous power of the Holy Ghoſt, to embrace Chriſtianity, repent, and be forgiven: but they that reſiſted the miracles wrought before their eyes, and plain to their ſenſes, could and would have no more powerful means to induce them to repentance; and without repentance they could never be forgiven.

I ſhall not obſerve on B's moſt ridiculous account, that by Armageddon in the Revelations is meant the Britiſh Houſe of Parliament; but only give a very ingenious interpretation thereof*—" The ſlaughter by the wine preſs of blood, ch. xiv. 20, is further ſaid—that it flowed for the ſpace or extent of 1600 furlongs: ſo that Armageddon ſeems to be denoted here, in the extent of it, as the field of battle, which is now turned into a field of blood. Now what place can we imagine to be ſo properly meant by this as the terri-

* See the Apocalyptical Key.

tory

tory of the See of Rome in Italy, which is extended the ſpace of 200 Italian miles; that is, exactly 1600 furlongs; the Italian mile conſiſting of eight furlongs. Beſides the word may juſtly be derived from two Hebrew words; the one ſignifying both a *Malediction* or *Anathema*, and a *Deſtruction* or *Slaughter*, and the other *an Army*, or *their Armies:* ſo that both the Anathemas darted againſt the Saints by the Romaniſts, and their armies made uſe of againſt them, may be here alluded to, in the expiration of both their eccleſiaſtical and temporal intereſt. So that the See of Rome in Italy ſeems to be the place called Armageddon, where the final deſtruction of Anti-chriſtianiſm will be."

As to B's information reſpecting the preſent war (in his letters to the King, &c. in May and June 1792) before it was thought of, he manifeſts an inferiority to politicians of moderate knowledge, inſtead of being divinely inſpired; as the relative intereſts and connections of the different European ſtates, and the ſituation of France and the conduct of the King of that unhappy country, left little doubt of the conſequences that have enſued: and as for the conduct of our allies, and the diſaſtrous effects, together with the motives and political views of the reſpective powers, they have been more clearly, juſtly, and truly delineated by ſeveral members in both Houſes of Parliament. For another of his boaſted predictions—" he pronounced the priſoners indicted for high-treaſon innocent;" and they were acquitted of treaſon—he

ſeems to ſtand indebted to Lord Thurlow, who declared in the Houſe of Lords, " that there was much of ſedition, but that it did not amount to *treaſon.*" Even allowing B's politics and his opinion reſpecting the priſoners his own genuine productions, they argue not a divine inſpiration; as others have undeniably delivered more able ſentiments on theſe ſubjects.

But ſurely this wonderful prophet has been deſerted by God, ſince ſome events have happened contrary, or not fell out agreeably, to his prognoſtications.—" Will England, ſays he, continue this war any longer for her deſtruction, that they may enter into a freſh one with America to haſten it?" And again, " The United States of America will declare war againſt England:" the recent treaty hath ſhewn B. a falſe prophet.—" The King of Pruſſia will prevail againſt France three years and a * half:" how is this to be ſupported?—" The Engliſh government, both what is called civil and eccleſiaſtical, in its preſent form, will by the fierce anger and determined judgment of the Lord God be removed, annihilated, and utterly deſtroyed, before the expiration of ten months from this day:" his book is dated April 11, 1794†, and this wonderful revolution ought,

* The time in this prophecy of Daniel is ſynchronical with that in Revelations, which H. owns to mean 1260 years.

† This date ought to be abided by, being that of the books delivered by B. himſelf; yet I underſtand he, or ſome one for him, hath lately had the cunning in ſome inſtances to alter the date with a pen.

therefore,

therefore, to have taken place before the 11th day of February laſt; it would, if it had been foretold by the influence of the Holy Ghoſt *.

I ſhall now examine the powers alluded to by the Beaſts, and give you that account of them which hath been agreed on by the learned in all ages; and ſo little hath theſe deſcriptions ever been queſtioned as to their propriety, that they have been inſiſted on, by ſome wiſe men, even to have been wrote ſubſequent to the events: inaſmuch, as the delineations were ſo perfect in all their parts †. It is unneceſſary to animadvert on the novel, ridiculous, and forced applications of B. and H.

The four beaſts (Daniel vii. v. 2—8.) are deſcribed as riſing from a ſtormy ſea, becauſe the foundations of thoſe empires were laid by war and diſturbances; they are called Great, in reſpect of their ſuperiority over other ſtates and kingdoms; and repreſented by beaſts, on account of their cruelty, rapine, and oppreſſion.

V. 4. That as the lion is eſteemed the king of beaſts, and the eagle the king of birds; therefore the kingdom of Babylon, as the firſt and nobleſt, is pourtrayed as partaking of both; and the eagle's wings denote the rapidity of its advancement by Nebuchadnezzar. "The wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth (or

* B. alſo perſiſted to the laſt, in his converſations, that Caroline of Brunſwick would never be Princeſs of Wales in England.

† See Newton's Diſſertations on the Prophecies.

rather, wherewith it was);" *i. e.* the Medes and Perſians were then encroaching upon it, and Babylon was taken and transferred to them in that reign of Belſhazzar: "and it was made to ſtand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it;" *i. e.* the Babylonians were brought to a juſt ſenſe of their ſituation, left off boaſting, and found themſelves but men; to this interpretation agrees the expreſſion, Pſ. ix. 20.

The ſecond beaſt, v. 5. is the kingdom of the Medes and Perſians, which is compared to a bear, a voracious and cruel animal, becauſe of their cruelty and rapaciouſneſs; and therefore the prophet ſays,—"Ariſe, devour much fleſh:" and "it raiſed up itſelf on one ſide (or, it raiſed up one dominion);" for the Perſians were ſubject to the Medes at the conqueſt of Babylon, but ſoon after raiſed up themſelves above them: and "it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it;" *i. e.* Babylon, Lydia, and Egypt, conquered by it, but not members of its body; ribs, as their conqueſt ſtrengthened the Perſian empire, and between the teeth, to ſignify that they were much grinded and oppreſſed by the Perſians.

The third beaſt, v. 6. the kingdom of the Macedonians or Grecians under Alexander, is compared to a leopard. As the leopard was remarkable for its ſwiftneſs, ſo was Alexander for the rapidity of his conqueſts; which is alſo repreſented by the "four wings of a fowl," and ſignified how much he exceeded Nebuchadnezzar herein, who was deſcribed with only "two wings:" as the

leopard

leopard is of comparatively little ſtature, yet of great courage, ſo as to be ſaid to engage even with the lion, and largeſt beaſts; ſo Alexander, comparatively a little king, and with a ſmall army, dared to attack Darius: as the leopard is ſpotted, it was emblematical of the different manners of the nations Alexander conquered; alſo of the various manners of himſelf, who was merciful and cruel, temperate and drunken, abſtemious and incontinent. "The beaſt had alſo four heads," in alluſion to the four chief captains of Alexander, who, after his death, divided the kingdom; Caſſander reigning over Macedon and Greece, Lyſimachus over Thrace and Bithynia, Ptolemy over Egypt, and Seleucus over Syria: "and dominion was given to it;" *i. e.* unleſs it had been the will of God, by whoſe mighty power Alexander muſt have been preſerved, he could not, with his army, have conquered all the countries from Greece to India.

The fourth beaſt, v. 7. was ſo great and horrible, that it was not eaſy to find an adequate name for it; this can be no other than the Roman empire. It certainly was dreadful, terrible, and ſtrong, "exceedingly beyond any of the former kingdoms:" "it had great iron teeth;" whatſoever we could imagine moſt fierce in beaſts, that we ſhould underſtand the Romans to be: "it devoured and brake in pieces, and ſtamped the reſidue with the feet of it." It ſubdued the remains of the former kingdoms, and thoſe nations who had been ſubject to them, and did become in

a manner, what the Roman writers called it, the Empire of the World: "it was diverſe from all the beaſts that were before it," not only in its republican form of government, but in length of duration, power, and ſtrength of dominion: "and it had ten horns," alluding to the ten kings or kingdoms into which the Roman empire was diſmembered by the incurſions of the Northern nations. But v. 8 another little horn is ſaid to ariſe among the former ten; which means the Pope. His having "eyes like a man," denotes his artifice and cunning; "and a mouth ſpeaking great things," the pompous titles he aſſumes, and the divine power he arrogates to himſelf, ſee v. 25. "Before whom there were three of the firſt horns plucked up by the roots:" the Exarchate of Ravenna given to St. Peter and his ſucceſſors for a perpetual poſſeſſion; the kingdom of the Lombards, and the greateſt part of their dominions; and the ſtate of Rome, which was not, until after ſeveral ſtruggles, ſubject to the Pope in things temporal: indeed the Pope hath, as it were, pointed out himſelf as the perſon, by wearing the triple Crown. And he was properly called a "little horn," as the power of the Popes was originally ſmall. Beſides theſe irrefragable proofs, that by the little horn is meant the Pope or Antichriſt, that we might not be deceived in a matter of ſuch moment, we have Papacy ſtrongly characterized in other parts of this chapter. V. 20. "Whoſe look was more ſtout than his fellows," aſſuming an authority not only over his fellow-Biſhops,

Biſhops, but over Kings and Emperors. V. 25. "He ſhall wear out the Saints of the Moſt High," the faithful ſervants of Chriſt, by wars, maſſacres, inquiſitions, and perſecutions; ibid. "and think to change times and laws," by inſtituting new modes of worſhip, impoſing new articles of faith, and enjoining new rules of practice; ibid. "they ſhall be given into his hand for a time, and times, and the dividing of time;" and v. 9—14, v. 18, v. 22, v. 26, 27, ſhew the dominion of the Pope to continue until Chriſtians gain the upper hand of their perſecutors, and the tyranny of Antichriſt to be ſucceeded by the happy Millennium.

H. ſays, "that B. hath given us the clue to unravel the figurative alluſions—not only of theſe four beaſts, as well as of the book of Revelations; and that he could not, unleſs by divine inſpiration, have found this key; but that only probable gueſſes have been formed by others as to a ſingle beaſt, or two, which he ſeems even to doubt *." Surely he will not continue to inſult the underſtanding of Engliſhmen ſo groſsly, as to perſiſt to oppoſe the incoherent abſurdities of B. and his own ſubtle explanations, to a deſcription complete, clear, and evident to the meaneſt capacity; and which (as I before obſerved) doth ſo exactly coincide with the events, that it hath by ſome been held as wrote after they had taken place.

* Theſe are not his exact words, but his argument, p. 11, 12, of his Teſtimony of the Authenticity, &c.

Now that St. John in Revelations doth ſpeak of Antichriſt or Papacy, will appear evident upon your peruſing the 13th and 17th chapters of Revelations, and comparing them with what I have ſaid of the little Horn in Daniel. Indeed both B. and H. confeſs Antichriſt to be meant by Babylon; though in one place H. affirms London is intended. It is truly very convenient for thoſe gentlemen to interpret Scripture either literally, figuratively, or by the moſt forced applications. But in what place is it called *another* Babylon, or where is it ſaid there are *two* Babylons? And had H. conſidered the hiſtory of Rome Pagan, or Rome Papal, he would have recollected that the articles of merchandize ſpecified were particularly in demand there, and conſequently the merchants who dealt in thoſe commodities would naturally lament the loſs of ſo excellent a mart. As to the ſlave-trade, you know my abhorrence of it, and that I have, to the utmoſt of my power, endeavoured the abolition of ſo diſgraceful a traffic, by procuring a petition to the Houſe of Commons for that purpoſe; and ſo far from the dealing in ſlaves being applicable to this country, the moment one of thoſe unfortunate perſons ſteps on this happy iſle, he is immediately free. H. cannot, will not I am ſure, attempt to vindicate Rome from having deſerved this nefarious epithet. As to dealing in "ſouls of men," the Roman Catholic religion is thereby juſtly pourtrayed with reſpect to its doctrines and tenets; but it cannot be ſaid ſo of this country

country and its eſtabliſhed religion: nay, H. is himſelf a ſtriking example to the contrary; though he deſired to "ſell his ſoul," yet he could not find a purchaſer.

It now remains for me to ſpeak of the Millennium; and which I ſhall endeavour to calculate from Divine authority, and the years ſince Chriſt. The latter B. hath prudently acknowledged right, to prevent a detection of the fallacy of his works even by the moſt ignorant; and the Divine authority will be paſſages of Daniel and the Revelations ſo explained, as H. allows to be indiſputable. To obſerve any thing on B's dogmatic, unſupported, and erroneous computation of the age of the world A. C., from which B. and H. reckon the millenary commencement, would be a ſcandalous infringement on your time, which could not, unleſs in doing wrong, be more worthleſsly employed.

There is a tradition among the Jews, as well as Chriſtians, that the world ſhould continue 6000 years, as the earth was created in ſix days; and as God reſted on the ſeventh day, ſo there ſhould be a Millennium, or happy ſtate, for the Saints on earth. And this tradition farther ſuppoſes, that as there were 2000 years from the creation to Abraham without a particular directory of religion, and 2000 from thence to Chriſt under the law, ſo there would be 2000 more under the Meſſiah. Such a tradition is much to be relied on, eſpecially when capable of being ſupported by collateral Scripture doctrines; for ſuch ſeem to have originated from

God,

God, and been implicated by Him into the mind of man; otherwiſe, from length of time and human viciſſitudes, they would univerſally have been forgotten. It behoves us, then, to ſee whether this tradition is corroborated by the inſpired writings.

I have before obſerved, that the Millennium will commence at the complete deſtruction of Antichriſt or Papacy, as from the verſes ſelected from Dan. vii. and which is unqueſtionably proved by Rev. xi. 3. and xii. 6; Rev. xi. 2. and xiii. 5; and Rev. xii. 14. (compared with Dan. vii. 25.) for it is evident that the "time, times, and dividing of time *" in Daniel, and the "1260 days," and "42 months," and the "time, times, and half a time" in Revelations, are ſynchronical, from their applications to the ſame events, and the annexed table †. As each day denotes a year, and that Papacy is to continue 1260 days or years, when it will be utterly deſtroyed, it is neceſſary to inquire, that

* B. in hopes of making it ſuit his purpoſe, referred this to the King of Pruſſia, and called it three years and a half; yet H. allows in other inſtances, it ought to be reckoned according to my account.

† Dan. and Rev.

		Days.
Time, 1 prophetical year conſiſting of	-	360
Times, 2 ditto	- - -	720
Dividing of time Dan. / Rev. / Half a time	Half of a prophetical year, or	180
	Days	1260

And

that we may aſcertain this period, and thereby the beginning of the Millennium, from whence we are to date its eſtabliſhment.

Papacy indeed took its riſe from the diſſolution of the Roman empire; but the prophecies will not fairly apply, nor doth it ſeem proper, that the date of Antichriſt ſhould be taken, before its complete inveſtment with thoſe characters by which it is delineated in Scripture. This is about the year of our Lord 756, when the Pope was made head of Rome in a ſecular, as well as eccleſiaſtical, ſenſe, a great part of Italy given to him, and he made a ſecular Prince, by Pepin King of France. Now by adding the years 1260 (refer to the table) to 756, the deſtruction of Antichriſt will, by this calculation, happen A. D. 2016; only 16 years wide of the old tradition, according to our undenied numbers of years ſince Chriſt. And I think it very probable, that ſome circumſtance, though not noticed, yet of eventual moment, laid the foundation of this conduct of Pepin towards the

And as each prophetical year conſiſts of 360 days, or of 12 months, each month, conſequently, contains 30 days.

	Days.
1 prophetical month - - -	30
Multiplied by 42 - - -	42
	60
	120
Gives the number of days in 42 months -	1260

So that the time, times, and dividing of time in Daniel; the 1260 days, the 42 months, and the time, times, and half a time in Revelations, are clearly ſynchronical, or denote the ſame number of years.

Pope

Pope 16 years before, which would bring us down exactly to the year of our Lord 2000 *.

It has been common in these calculations to distinguish between the prophetical and the Julian year, as the one only contains 360 days, and the other 365 days, 5 hours, some minutes and seconds: but I consider that by a prophetical day is meant the entire annual revolution of the earth round the sun, as by a natural day is understood the revolution of the earth round its axis †.

Instead of B. and H's hypotheses of the wonderful revolution to be accomplished in the year 1798, the millenary reign of the Saints is to be expected about the year 2000; but let us not confound this peaceful state of the Church with the consummation of all things, as they are plainly distinguished in Rev. xx. for after the 1000 years, we are informed Satan shall again be let loose, and after that will be the day of judgment. So that even this state of the Church is not to be expected as void of all wickedness, or that it hath corrupted itself from long prosperity; nevertheless, as the state of the Church will, comparatively speaking, be perfect goodness and tranquillity to its former persecutions and wickedness, it is thus favourably

* I would recommend Fleming's Apocalyptical Key; a book of great good sense and ingenuity, and to which I am indebted.

† It has been conjectured by some, that there was before the fall no diurnal, but only an annual, rotation of the earth, and consequently no day of 24 hours; as the original reason of the Scripture putting days for years.

described;

deſcribed; and as the day of judgment was foretold by our Saviour under the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, ſo is the fruition of eternal happineſs typified by this peaceful ſtate of the Church on earth.

Having thus conſidered what I eſteem the moſt ſtriking features of the books of B. and H., it appears a requiſite duty to vindicate our conſtitution, both eccleſiaſtical and civil, from ſome imputations thrown out againſt it by thoſe perſons.

1. B. ſpeaks of war as totally inconſiſtent with a nation profeſſing Chriſtianity. It muſt be acknowledged, that "if Chriſtian nations were nations of Chriſtians, we ſhould have wars no more (among nations profeſſing Chriſtianity);" but ſtill they are ſometimes unavoidable; and if perfectly inconſiſtent with our religion, the Goſpel would have prohibited, inſtead of preſcribing rules for the conduct of ſoldiers; and it is well worthy obſervation, that the centurion Cornelius was vouchſafed an eſpecial revelation for his embracing Chriſtianity. This is to be confeſſed, that war, unleſs founded on equity and ſelf-defence, is highly criminal; but if indiſcriminately abſtained from by Chriſtians, we muſt become the prey of the wicked and ambitious, the firſt beſt right of man —our liberty—be taken away, and the world become ſubject to Mahometans, Infidels, and people who have not God before their eyes.

2. The reception of the Sacrament to enable perſons to fill official capacities. A man will not hire a menial ſervant without pre-required ſtipulations;

lations; and why ſhould the eſſential offices of a kingdom be unconditionally filled? And, ſince the eccleſiaſtical and civil eſtabliſhments are ſo interwoven, as reciprocally neceſſary for each other's ſupport, the eſtabliſhed religion ought to be obſerved by thoſe who fill ſtate-employments; beſides, as no man can be ſo faithfully depended on in the Cabinet, the Houſe, or the Field, as a good Chriſtian, and that no one can be ſo eſteemed, who doth not ſolemnly make a practice of partaking the holy ſacrament, it is with great good reaſon required. If they do it only for worldly advantage, which is certainly judging very uncharitably, and can be known only by God; if they will "ſell their ſouls" for worldly lucre, the fault is not in the government, but in the individuals ſo acting.

3. The Impiety of Ordination. Our Saviour—the Shepherd and Biſhop of our ſouls, and High Prieſt—was conſecrated by the unction of the Holy Ghoſt, who overſhadowed Him at his baptiſm: after his reſurrection, He appointed the Apoſtles ſupreme governors of his viſible church, John xx. 22, 23.—"He breathed on them, and ſaith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghoſt. Whoſeſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whoſeſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained:" and Matt. xxviii. 20. he promiſes to be with them, and their ſucceſſors, to the end of the world. The Apoſtles inveſted with this power ordained Deacons with impoſition of hands, Acts vi. 6. and Preſbyters, xiv. 23: they alſo ordained Biſhops,

as

as Titus at Crete, and Timothy at Epheſus, ordering them " to ordain elders in every city, and to rebuke with all authority, 2 Tim. ii. 2. Titus i. 5. ii. 15. Our form of ordination is therefore of pure evangelical inſtitution, and not to be idly abandoned at the inſtigation of every pretender to divine inſpiration.

4. To obviate H's objection of the Faſt-Days, it is but neceſſary to obſerve, that the practice obtained under the Jewiſh diſpenſation; that it hath been obſerved in times of national diſtreſs—to acknowledge our iniquities, to implore the Almighty to avert his wrath, and to ſolicit his mercy and forgiveneſs: ſurely this is a moſt rational appointment. Had H. read the title-page of the Form of Prayer, he could not have ſpoke of the appointment as he hath done, p. 40; if he had, his method of expreſſing himſelf is a moſt flagrant attempt to deceive.

In reſpect of B. I have nothing further to ſay, than heartily to pity his mental imbecility; for there is little doubt to be entertained on that head; otherwiſe, a man that profeſſes ſo great a veneration for the Goſpel, would imitate the bleſſed Jeſus, by rendering unto Cæſar the things that are Cæſar's; he would not, by books of an inflammatory nature, tending to diſturb the peace of the country, and to make weak minds unhappy, thus violate the laws of the kingdom. But there is one myſtery I will thank H., or any other of B's friends, to unravel: by what means he became poſſeſſed of ſuch conſiderable ſums, as he hath employed

ployed in the diſtribution of his prophecies? I fear ſome perſons, inimical to our happy conſtitution, muſt have weakly imagined, that this unfortunate man's works might promote their wiſhes. For the laſt reaſon, H. ſhould have been extremely cautious how he brought them into ſo much notice by his writings.

I ſhall conclude with a few obſervations on H.

It is evident from his firſt book, that he hath purſued a political diſſertation inſtead of a religious inquiry: he doth not indeed ſeem fitted for the latter taſk. How derogatory to the dignity of God, to level his inſpired writings with the fables of men? To tell us in one place, "that prophecies are calculated to appear as a tiſſue of the moſt incongruent abſurdities," and in another, that "in ſome inſtances they are contrived for the ſole purpoſe of miſguiding." If his Brachmanical mythology has proceeded no farther than his Scripture knowledge, he is a perfect novice therein: though I will not deny the great ingenuity he has ſhewn in decyphering B's predictions; but a man muſt be mad or fooliſh who does not ſee through the flimſineſs of the covering—Diſappointment and chagrin. This is alſo to be perceived through his firſt ſpeech in the Houſe of Commons on the confinement of B., and which makes him labour ſo much to attain the reputation of candour and diſintereſtedneſs. I readily believe him when he declares *that he has no ſiniſter view to overthrow the conſtitution*; but he ſhould be careful how he indulges malice; becauſe inconſiſtent

conſiſtent with Chriſtianity, and, at an eventful period like the preſent, may lead to conſequences little imagined by H: a vital ſtab may be given to a country, while only the injury of a party is intended. Since H. profeſſes ſuch candour of conduct, why does he expreſs himſelf in ſuch ambiguous terms, p. 15.—" For very obvious reaſons, I omit to ſpeak of the firſt beaſt, which we are told means the King of England; and ſhall uſe ſo much the leſs ceremony with the ſecond." I wiſh he would favour the public with an explanation of this paſſage. I cannot but interpret it thus, neither can any of my friends—*It is my inclination to ſcandalize the King of England, as well as the other Monarchs, and the dread of the laws alone reſtrains me.* As to H's aſſertion, " that he repeatedly aroſe, and even communicated to the Speaker a deſire to deliver his ſentiments on the war, to no purpoſe," I will not believe. If he ſpoke improperly, the Speaker would aſſuredly call him to order; but the Houſe of Commons is not, I am convinced, ſo proſtituted, as not to have a member to aſſert the unqueſtionable right of every repreſentative therein. It is a groſs libel on the ſpirit and integrity of the whole Houſe. But I muſt confeſs, that were I of that reſpectable body, elected by Britons to aſſert their rights, when a man had publicly declared, *that for three years together he betrayed the important truſt confided to him, and was ready to violate the moſt ſacred engagements; and that he had altered his conduct not from conſcientious motives, but becauſe he could not obtain the*

wages of his iniquity, I ſhould be ſtrongly inclined, from a principle of duty, to vote his expulſion. It would be very indecorous to deny any perſon's affirmations reſpecting his own conduct, otherwiſe I would not believe any one ſo vile. Is ſuch a one meet to ſtand forward in, and anticipate the leaſt credit to his, ſupport of writings, ſaid to be divinely inſpired? One thing I hope, that as H. argues London is expreſſed by Babylon, he will be careful to abſtain from *Fornication*. As to the ſenſe of H's ſpeeches in the Houſe, that needs not a farther comment, than that he cannot even obtain a ſingle member to ſecond his motion; and theſe manifeſt that his ſilence before proceeded from other cauſes, than his being prevented to ſpeak. And as to his pamphlet on the Millennium, it is really too futile and inſignificant to merit a particular reply; and if I had not known it edited by H., I ſhould have pronounced it a deception, contrived between the author and the bookſeller, to ſwindle the public. I would adviſe H. for the future to employ his natural abilities more worthily, and not be actuated by vexatious diſappointment—of being denied the opportunity of proſecuting the developement of the myſterious and allegorical compoſitions of the old Hindoos in India, or to apply himſelf thereto in England. But they have not here, perhaps, the art of converting every incident into gold.

To call any human inſtitution perfect, is little ſhort of madneſs; but we are certainly bleſſed with a happy conſtitution, both in Church and State.

It

It behoveth us therefore, collectively and individually, to endeavour to ſupport it, and to omit no opportunity of diſcharging our reſpective duties, that we may continue to enjoy its bleſſings during our lives, and to tranſmit them unimpaired to our poſterity. Theſe ideas have been the governing principle of the preceding Strictures.

FINIS.

10 FE 58